DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 985 IR 056 718

AUTHOR Garrett, Amy B.
TITLE Fee Versus Free in Libraries.
PUB DATE 1997-06-26
NOTE 39p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses (040) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Content Analysis; Document Delivery; Elementary Secondary Education; *Fees; Higher Education; *Information Retrieval; Interlibrary Loans; Libraries; Library Funding; Library Policy; *Library Services; Online Searching; *Reference Services; Reprography; User Needs (Information); *Users (Information)

ABSTRACT

This study examines 104 articles on the fee versus free controversy in libraries, written primarily between the years of 1992 and 1997. The content analysis assesses the types of libraries that charges fees--academic, public, school, or special; who is charged--everyone, businesses and their personnel, law firms and lawyers; and what services the libraries charge for--for example, interlibrary loan, document delivery, and online searching. The study examines the country in which each article is based to see if there is greater or lesser concern about the fee versus free issue in certain countries. Public libraries are prevalent chargers and charge all groups of patrons. Patrons are charged most often for online searching and photocopying. Most libraries that charge fees are responding to difficulties with providing additional services that customers demand, but that budget authorities are often unwilling or unable to fund. There is no such thing as "free" library service--almost everyone pays some sort of tax in support of the general operation of their library. Appendices include a coding categories key, a coding sheet, content analysis data, and citations for the articles examined. (Contains 14 references.) (SWC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

IR

ED 412 985

FEE VERSUS FREE IN LIBRARIES

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Amy B. Garrett

June 26, 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Du Mont
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR056718

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study is an examination of one hundred-four (104) articles written, for the most part, between the years of 1992 and 1997. This content analysis looks at frequency in the type of library that charges, e.g. academic, public, school or special. It looks at who is being charged, e.g. everyone, businesses and their personnel, law firms and lawyers, etc.; what services these libraries are charging for, e.g. Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery, Online Searching and others. This study also examines the country for where each article is based in order to see if a pattern can be determined for who (again, what country) is most concerned with the issue of Fee versus Free in Library Service or whether or not to charge fees. Finally, this study takes a look at what the main theme or issue is in each library and what that library's service reflects overall, whether it be fee, free or free with restrictions.

It was determined that public libraries are the prevalent chargers and everyone is being charged. Customers (patrons) are being charged most for services like Online Searching and Xeroxing because libraries are underbudgeted and have no way of funding these *new* services that libraries are expected to provide. The overall view is to charge and will probably continue on this path as more and more libraries get connected to the technology available.

Master's Research Paper by

Amy B. Garrett

B.S.ED., Ohio University, 1994

M.L.S. Kent State University, 1997

Approved by

Advisor_____Date_____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iv

INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of the Study 1
Definition of Terms 2
Limitations of the Study 3

LITERATURE REVIEW 4

METHODOLOGY 9

ANALYSIS OF DATA 10
Library Type: 10
Service Type: 11
Who Pays: 13
Issue/Theme: 13
Country: 15
Library Service: 15

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 17

APPENDIX A: CODING CATEGORIES KEY 19

APPENDIX B: CODING SHEET 21

APPENDIX C: CONTENT ANALYSIS DATA 22

APPENDIX D: ARTICLES EXAMINED 26

REFERENCE LIST 33

LIST OF TABLES

Table A Distribution of Libraries by Type 10

Table B Distribution of Charges by Service Type 12

Table C Distribution of Users Charged Fees 13

Table D Distribution of Issues/Themes Related to Fees 14

Table E Countries in Literature Discussing Fees 15

Table F Distribution of Libraries with Fee or Free Service 16

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There are many issues relating to librarianship, one of which is Fee versus Free, or whether or not to charge for library services. Fee versus Free has been a hot topic within the library community for decades. The ideological question of whether it is a betrayal of public trust or a practical necessity for libraries to charge for certain services will continue to be debated long after this paper is completed. Most libraries that charge fees are responding to difficulties for providing additional services (like online searching) that customers demand, but budget authorities are often unwilling or unable to fund. Although we hear about the plight of public libraries and the issue of "charging for services" most often, there is growing concern in academic, school and special libraries, as well.

This universal issue has become more of a concern in the last decade because of the increased use of computerized services libraries are expected to provide. These include, but are not limited to, Interlibrary Loan, Internet Use and Document Delivery.

Many articles have been written on this topic and many opinions expressed. The articles available usually consider a specific library and/or specific service. To the best of my knowledge, there has never been a paper written that examines a percentage of the literature as a whole to see where the concern really lies and/or if it still exists.

Purpose of the Study

It is the purpose of this study to discover who, or more specifically, what type of library, e.g. academic, is charging for library service, who is being charged, what services libraries are charging for and why they are charging. It is also of interest to survey where (what country) the

subject of these articles is based to observe if there is a pattern to all this madness.

Definition of Terms

It should be noted that there is no such thing as "free" library service. Almost everyone pays some sort of tax in support of the general operation of their library. The following definitions govern items mentioned in this paper.

Fee -- Charges levied against individual consumers of publicly produced services and publicly granted priveledges on a cost per unit basis.

Free -- No additional fees will be charged beyond original taxes paid.

CD -- Computer CD-ROM's only!!

Audiovisual -- Items included in this category are: books on tape, videos, music cassettes and compact discs, microfiche/microfilm.

Academic Library -- Any college or university library, except medical, legal and business libraries that may be housed on campus, but are not considered a part of the library, e.g. Akron Law Library.

School Library -- Any library in a school that includes grades K-12 (K-13 in Canada).

Special Library -- These libraries are often found in corporations, hospitals, historical sites and museums, etc. Also located under this category would be the medical, legal and business libraries mentioned above under Academic Libraries.

Free with Restrictions -- Service in general is free, but some item(s) may exude a fee, e.g. Internet Use and first ten pages printed are free, each additional page is five cents.

Non-Egalitarian -- Not equal.

Online Searching -- Exploring a specific database in search of a specific item not found

elsewhere. Items included here are DIALOG and OCLC.

Document Delivery -- Ordering a particular item and having it delivered to you within a certain time frame.

Interlibrary Loan — Borrowing an item(s) from another library that this library does not own to satisfy a patron's needs or wants.

Facsimile (a.k.a. FAX) — Sending or receiving information in hard copy via a phone line.

The following items define who pays for various library services.

All — Everyone pays.

Business — Only Businesses or Business Personnel pay for selected services.

Legal — Only Law Firms and Legal Personnel pay for selected services.

Other — This category represents any other specialized group or set of people that are being charged, e.g. professors, medical students, etc.

Underbudgeted — Library cannot afford to provide these services without extracting a fee.

Group Denied — A specific group or set of people is being denied access.

Competitiveness — Charges are being extracted from patrons because others are doing it and these libraries want to be able to compete in the fast lane of library service.

Other — Any other reason is listed or when multiple reasons are listed.

Limitations of the Study

This study examines all fees in all types of libraries except fines for overdue or damaged materials.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

A historic myth has saturated librarianship during the twentieth century. The myth is that any member of society should have free and equal access to the library and, by definition, the resources that have been assembled. Since the mid 1980s, there has been a push to charge fees for library services. According to Pete Giacoma, "the public policy environment of the late 1980s decisively favors a growing role for user fees . . . While debate continues within the library profession, new fees are being adopted and old ones increased so frequently that one may justifiably wonder how many librarians are still listening to the voices arguing for the preservation" of the free library (Giacoma 1989, 156). This push has become a shove as we plod further into the 1990s and a more computerized environment. The arguments for the charging of fees far outweigh those against. Back in 1986, these arguments were given for why fees should not be charged:

1. Library services are a public good and are a fundamental right of each citizen in a democratic society.
2. Fees are illegal (In America, there is some legislation that supports this).
3. Fees are discriminatory meaning only those who can afford to pay are benefited by the service.
4. Fees represent a form of double taxation.
5. Fees might not be used to support public services.
6. It is difficult to distinguish between basic and special services.
7. If the service cannot be provided without a fee, it should not be provided.

8. There is considerable staff resistance to fees.

9. Charging for a service subjects libraries to liability risks because of the responsibilities implicit in providing a service for a fee (Bowker 1986).

The following pro-fee arguments were provided in contradiction to the anti-fee arguments:

1. Charging fees increases recognition of the value and importance of library services.

2. Fees encourage efficient use of public resources.

3. Fees promote service levels based on need and demand.

4. Fees limit waste and over consumption.

5. The tradition of charging fees is part of [American] culture.

6. Fees control growth and lower demand for service.

7. Escalating service costs make user fees a necessity.

8. Most library users can afford to pay a fee.

9. Without fees, libraries could not serve the larger community and nonresidents (Bowker 1986).

Kenneth Marks argued the same thing seven years later. In his arguments against the charging of fees, he implied that free library service was damaged by the charging of fees. Charging fees caused inequalities among users and acquisition of materials would begin to be geared to those who could pay. On the other hand, users pay for other utilities such as bridges, highways, parks, etc. Fees allow the development of special services which would not otherwise be provided like online searching and Interlibrary Loan (Marks 1992). Today, these arguments still exist.

The 1980s were a time of dramatic change in how public institutions raised and invested financial resources. Traditional revenue sources were lagging behind funding requirements for service delivery. Financial capacity was limited and the competition for funding was great. In response to this pressure, there was a significant growth in user fees within the public sector between 1971 and 1981 (Bowker 1986).

In 1985, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science did a study on "The Role of Fees in Supporting Library and Information Services in Public and Academic Libraries." They looked at many different surveys from the 1970s and 1980s to see what types of libraries were charging and what types of services libraries were charging for. A 1981 survey done by the American Library Association (ALA) showed that 709 libraries, including 415 university, 93 four-year college, 50 government agency and 38 public, were already charging fees for services. Studies done in 1977 showed that the top five services libraries were charging for were (in ranking order): photocopying, reserve notification, meeting rooms (after hours), audiovisual equipment and film rental. By 1984, database searching (online) was the number one item libraries were charging for followed by AV materials, e.g. films, AV equipment, e.g. film projectors, reserves (hold on a book not in) and University of Washington Resource Sharing Program fees (RSP) (Bowker 1986).

In 1996, David Gee conducted a survey of 88 academic law librarians in Great Britain. The following general conclusions were made based on the answers given from the thirty-eight respondents. Most of Great Britain's law libraries do not try to generate significant income from their local legal communities. Half of the libraries surveyed do not charge for personal admission; only a third of the law libraries offer some kind of fee based document delivery. The

main reason for this reluctance to charge fees and to offer fee based information services is the widespread assumption that local legal communities do not want, or are not prepared to pay for, such services (Gee 1996).

Many libraries that charge fees do so because they would be unable to provide the services otherwise. The Capital City College Library had to begin charging students and faculty for Interlibrary Loans after the number of requests increased by 53% over a two year period. It is now their policy to allow each student and faculty member fifteen (15) free Interlibrary Loans (ILLs) per semester. After that each ILL carries a flat fee of $15. Photocopy Requests carry a flat fee of $2.50 (Anderson 1993). Orange County, California increased library fines and fees in an effort to provide an ailing twenty-eight branch system with badly needed funds (Grad 1995).

At three years experience with fee based services in a corporate library, Priscilla Ratliff and Thomas Weeks discuss the recovery of a large portion of the library's budget through user fees and also an increase in library usage (Ratliff 1995). Even the Library of Congress, which is the closest thing to a national library that the United States has, is trying to get into the act. The Library of Congress Fund Act of 1993 (S, 345), a revised version of legislation that died in congress in 1992 would authorize the Library of Congress to provide fee-based information products and services (American Libraries 1993, 288)..

Some libraries endeavor to not charge fees, but it is sometimes out of their hands. Seth Schulman indicated in his article that a commercial publishing and database company wanted $30,000 to provide service to Northwestern University. After much discussion, the company came back with a "free" offer and lots of strings attached (Schulman 1992). Northwestern declined the service.

Overall, most libraries seem to be attempting to provide the best service possible at the lowest cost possible, but there are others out there who are just trying to make a fast buck. Stanford Medical Library charges all non-users a $500 annual borrowing privilege fee and $200 for limited access to other services (American Libraries 1993, 471). Both the San Francisco Public Library and the Hawaii State Public Library System charge a flat rate of $60 for in-depth library research guaranteed to be delivered to you in twenty-four (24) hours (Schindler 1997), while others, especially law libraries, charge upwards of $1000 for service.

The buck stops here!! Many areas of the world see no need to charge fees, or, if they did, they have dropped their "fee" policy. The Hennepin County Library proposal to raise juvenile fees and fines was shelved after opposition from staff and an article in the local newspaper (School Library Journal 1996, 12). City commissioners in Eustis, Florida rejected a plan to charge citizens a fee for borrowing books from the town library because of political pressure (American Libraries 1992, 19). Even data processing firms are making an attempt to provide free service. The National Technical Information Service (Company) (NTIS) announced recently its release of NTIS OrderNow -- free online service used to identify and purchase United States Government Information Products (Saunders-McMaster 1997).

Overall, the literature is pretty straightforward. The same arguments that were presented more then ten years ago are still in effect and probably will be long after this paper is completed and I graduate. The libraries that are going to charge are going to and vice versa for the ones who are not. The most interesting part of this paper has yet to be tackled and that is discovering exactly who is charging, what they are charging for and why they are charging as a whole.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

For this study, I have chosen Content Analysis of approximately one hundred (100) articles. The time frame I am looking at is for the most part between 1992 and 1997. I have included some earlier articles that I consider to be of utmost value. Even though I am not examining this issue from a historical context, it seemed important to include at least a few "historical" articles in order to get a feeling for how the fee versus free issue has evolved.. This study is being completed in order to examine the frequency of the data and will be coded according to the following criteria: .

Type of library; Type of services the library is charging for; Who's being charged for these services? Are these services free with restrictions, e.g. service is free (generally), but after first 10 pages are downloaded, there is a fee for any additional pages.

What is the issue or theme surrounding these articles or why are the libraries charging, e.g. non-egalitarian (not equal), library is underbudgeted, etc.?

Finally, in what countries is this occurring? I am looking for a pattern in the charging game, e.g. US, Great Britain, Australia, Sweden, New Zealand, to name a few.

(See Coding Sheet in Appendix A for more insight into what information is being sought.)

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

For this study, I searched 104 articles for the following types of information: library type, service type, who pays for this service, the issue or main theme of the article, the country of where the article is based and the type of overall library service the article seems to convey. I will discuss each category in some detail and end with some general conclusions and observations.

Library Type:

For this study, I looked at all types of libraries (See Table A below):

Table A: Distribution of Libraries by Type

LIBTYPE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
ALL	18	17.6
ACADEMIC	13	12.7
SCHOOL	2	2.0
PUBLIC	37	36.3
SPECIAL	25	24.5
2 LIBRARIES	5	4.9
3 LIBRARIES	2	2.0
TOTAL	102	100.0

Of the 104 articles examined, 37 (36.3%) involved public libraries, specifically, while special libraries measured at 24.5 percent with 25 articles appearing in this study. Academic libraries appeared 13 times representing 12.7 percent of the population and, not surprisingly, school libraries only appeared twice when mentioned specifically.. All four library types: academic, public, school and special libraries appeared 18 times (17.6 %) when mentioned together as a whole, while two libraries were mentioned five times (4.9%) (academic and public were mentioned together four times and academic and special once) and 3 libraries (academic, public and special) were mentioned twice (2%).

Service Type:

For this category, I chose the seven most popular services for which libraries seem to be charging. I also included a category of "other" as a place to check off other items not included, e.g. meeting room rental, reserves, equipment loans, etc. These services were just too numerous to list, especially when the results I was getting were only one or two per category, so these became "**other**." It is necessary to mention that many of the articles mentioned more then one service for which they were charging so the total number of services outweighs the total number of articles. Also, percentages do not add up to 100% due to the multiple answers retrieved (See Table B below):

Table B: Distribution of Charges by Service Type

SERTYPE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
AUDIOVISUAL	9	8.7
CD-ROM	10	9.6
FAX	10	9.6
INTERLIBRARY LOAN	10	9.6
ONLINE SEARCHING	32	30.8
XEROXING	19	18.3
DOCUMENT DELIVERY	13	12.5
OTHER	60	57.7

Online Searching is where the fees are these days. Thirty-two articles (30.8%) mentioned the charging of this service, while only ten articles (9.6%) mentioned charging for CD-Rom searches. Nineteen articles (18.3%) stated that libraries were charging for xeroxing, while ten articles (9.6%) mentioned faxing charges. Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery services were comparable at ten (9.6%) and thirteen times (12.5%) mentioned respectively. Audiovisual materials such as videocassettes, books on tape, compact disks and cassettes (music) were mentioned nine times (8.7%). "Other" was named sixty times (57.7%), but as I explained before, items listed under this category were far too numerous to mention here.

Who Pays:

Almost everybody who is anybody is paying for library service. The four categories examined here were Business, Legal, All and Other. Once again, other covers a potpourri of people, including medical students, professors, researchers, etc. Out of 104 articles (scenarios), everyone was charged 71 times (73.2 %). Businesses and their personnel were charged eight times (8.2%) while law firms and lawyers were charged five times (5.2%). The official count for other was 13 (13.4%). Items can be examined more closely in Table C below.

Table C: Distribution of Users Charged Fees

WHOPAYS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
ALL	71	73.2
BUSINESS	8	8.2
LEGAL	5	5.2
OTHER	13	13.4
TOTAL	97	100.0

Issue/Theme:

Libraries are charging and that is a fact, but the issues arising from this need to charge are what

are interesting (See Table D below):

Table D: Distribution of Issues/Themes Related to Fees

IS/THEME	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NON EGALITARIAN	22	22.9
UNDER BUDGET	25	26.0
GROUP DENIED	13	13.5
COMPETITIVE	11	11.5
OTHER	25	26.0
TOTAL	96	99.9

Libraries are underbudgeted and the numbers reflect that. Twenty-five (25) articles (26%) threw out the issue of being underbudgeted when explaining why they charge fees. This figure represents approximately one-quarter (1/4) of the articles examined. Twenty-two articles (22.9%) raised the non-egalitarian (not equal) issue, while 13 of the articles (13.5%) examined named a specific group of people that were being denied service. Eleven (11) libraries were just out to make a fast buck. This figure is represented under the issue of competitiveness and equals 11.5% of the total articles read. Other was named twenty-five times (26%). Once again, this number represents a potpourri of the category.

Country:

Although the United States is the prevalent country (73.8%), there are other countries just as concerned with charging fees for services. See Table E below:

Table E: Countries in Literature Discussing Fees

COUNTRY	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
GREAT BRITAIN	4	3.9
NEW ZEALAND	2	1.9
UNITED STATES	76	73.8
OTHER	21	20.4
TOTAL	103	100.0

Great Britain appeared in four articles (3.9%), while New Zealand appeared in two (1.9%). Other included, but were not limited to the following countries: Australia, Sweden, Germany, France, Canada, South Africa, etc. These accounted for 20.4 percent of the total articles examined.

Library Service:

Most libraries are charging and their policies reflect this. Eighty of the 104 articles examined

showed that 77.7 percent of libraries provided a fee based service, while only seventeen (16.5%) stated that they were generally free with some restrictions and six (5.8%) claimed to provide totally free service (See Table F below)

Table F: Distribution of Libraries with Fee or Free Service

LIBSERV	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
FEE	80	77.7
FREE WITH RESTRICTIONS	17	16.5
FREE	6	5.8
TOTAL	103	100.0

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Although all libraries are charging, public libraries are making the most of issuing fees for services. The argument continues. Should a public institution be allowed to charge fees for services? According to the articles examined here, the answer is yes. Special libraries followed closely behind, and might have more of a *right* to charge because many are privately owned and the issue of private goods versus public goods comes into play.

According to the literature examined, the real issue regarding fee versus free did not come into play until the development of online searching and document delivery so it came as no surprise to see online searching leading the pack in services charged. What was a surprise was the number of document delivery articles. I thought there would be more, but again this study only represents a very small portion of the literature out there. I expect the number of libraries charging for items such as online searching, document delivery, faxing, etc. will increase as more libraries connect with the Internet and other networks.

Almost everyone is paying and I am sure that this will continue. Overall, libraries are not adequately funded to support all the services that libraries are expected to provide. When the issue of fee versus free first arose, there was no such thing as online searching, CD-ROMs, faxing, document delivery, etc. Libraries cannot exist and provide everything they are expected to on their current budgets. Libraries cannot be everything to everybody.

The United States is the country most often mentioned in these articles, but other countries are charging, as well. This is not an issue limited to only one country. This is worldwide. I cannot explain why I did not locate more articles for other countries. Some of the articles I read

mentioned many different countries within the same article. A few of these are reflected in "other."

APPENDIX A

Coding Categories and Issues for Examination in Content Analysis of Fees for Library Service

1. ID Number of Article: IDNUMBER
   (3 Numerical)

2. Library Type: LIBTYPE
   - A = Academic
   - P = Public
   - C = School
   - S = Special
   - 0 = All Libraries
   - X = 2 Libraries
   - Y = 3 Libraries

3. Type of Services that Charge: SERTYPE
   - AV = Audiovisual (music (cass/cd), books on tape, video)
   - CD = CD-ROM
   - FAX = Facsimile (sending and receiving)
   - ILL = Interlibrary Loan
   - ONL = Online Searching (Internet, DIALOG, etc.)
   - X = Xerox (copy fees)
   - DD = Document Delivery
   - O = Other

4. Who Pays for Service: WHOPAYS
   - A = All
   - B = Business
   - L = Legal
   - O = Other

5. Issue or Theme Discussed in the Article: IS/THEME
   - NE = Non-Egalitarian
   - UB = Library is Underbudgeted
   - GD = A Specific Group of People is Denied Access
   - CO = Competitiveness
   - O = Other

6. Country for where article takes place: Country

AU = Australia
GB = Great Britain
SW = Sweden
NZ = New Zealand
US = United States
O = Other

7. Charges for Library Service: LIBSERV

FE = Fee
FWR = Free with Restrictions
FR = Free

APPENDIX B

Content Analysis Coding Sheet
Example

ID	LIBTYPE	SERTYPE	WHOPAYS	IS/THEME	COUNTRY	LIBSER
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						

APPENDIX C

Content Analysis Data

ID	LIBTYPE	SERTYPE	WHOPAYS	IS/THEME	COUNTRY	LIBSERV
1	P	O	A	GD	US	FWR
2	S	O	A	NE	US	FE
3	S	O	A	NE	US	FE
4	P	O	O	CO	US	FWR
5	S	O	A	NE	US	FE
6	P	ILL	O	O	US	FE
7	S	O	A	NE	US	FE
8	P				US	FR
9	S	ALL,O	A	GD	US	FE
10	P	O	A	UB	US	FE
11	P	ILL	A	UB	US	FE
12	S	X	A	GD	US	FE
13	0	ONL	A	GD	O	FE
14	P	O	A	O	US	FE
15	A,P	ALL,O	A	O	US	FE
16	P	ONL	A	UB	US	FE
17	S	ONL	O	O	US	FE
18	S	DD	O	O	US	FE
19	P	O	A	GD	US	FWR
20	0	X	A	NE	US	FE
21	P	ONL	A	UB	NZ	FE
22	0	ILL	A	UB	GB	FWR
23	P	O	A	UB	US	FE
24	P	O	A	UB	O	FE
25	P	ALL,O	A	NE	US	FE
26	P	O	A	CO	US	FE
27	A	O	A	UB	US	FE

28	P	ONL,X,O	A	UB	O	FE
29	0	ONL	A	CO	US	FE
30	P				US	FR
31	0	ONL	A	NE	O	FE
32	0	CD	A	NE	US	FE
33	A	ILL	A	NE	US	FE
34	A	ONL	B	CO	US	FE
35	P	O	A	UB	O	FE
36	P	O	B	CO	GB	FE
37	S	O	A	GD	US	FE
38	S	O	A	GD	US	FE
39	S	ILL,DD	A	O	O	FE
40	P	O	A	GD	US	FWR
41	S	O	L	O	GB	FE
42	A	ILL,DD	A	O	US	FE
43	P	O	A	NE	US	FE
44	A,P,S	ILL	A	O	O	FE
45	P	O	A	UB	US	FE
46	0	ONL	A	O	US	FWR
47	S	O	B	O	O	FWR
48	A	O	O	O	US	FE
49	S	ONL,ILL,X	A	NE	US	FE
50	A	X	A	NE	US	FE
51	0	ONL	A	CO	US	FE
52	0	ONL	A	O	O	FE
53	S				O	FR
54	P	O	A	O	US	FE
55	S	O	B	CO	US	FE
56	P	O	A	UB	US	FE
57	A,P	ALL,O	A	NE	US	FWR
58	S	O	A	O	NZ	FE

59	P	O	A	UB	US	FE
60	P	ONL,X,O	A	UB	O	FE
61	P	O	A	GD	US	FWR
62	S	O	A	NE	US	FE
63	A	O	O	NE	US	FWR
64	A	X	A	NE	US	FE
65	S	FAX,ILL,ONL,X	L	NE	US	FE
66	0	O	A	UB	O	FE
67	P				US	FR
68	P	O	O	UB	US	FE
69	A	ONL	O	GD	US	FE
70	P	O	B	O	US	FE
71	S	O	O	O	US	FE
72	P	CD,O	A	UB	US	FE
73	P	ILL,O	A	O	US	FE
74	S	FAX,ONL,DD,X,O	L	GD	US	FE
75	0	ONL	A	NE	US	FE
76	0	ONL	A	GD	US	FE
77	0	CD	A	O	US	FE
78	P	AV,ILL,X,O	A	NE	US	FE
79	S	O	L	UB	US	FE
80	S	O	B	UB	US	FE
81	0	CD	A	CO	O	FE
82	P	O	A	UB	O	FE
83	P				O	FR
84	0	ONL	A	NE	O	FWR
85	S	AV,FAX,X,O	A	UB	US	FE
86	C				US	FR
87	C	O	O	UB	O	FWR
88	A,P	ONL	A	O	O	FE
89	S	DD,O	L	GD	US	FE

90	A	ONL	A	CO	US	FWR
91	0	O	A	NE	US	FWR
92	0	ONL	A	CO	O	FE
93	S	FAX,ILL,ONL,DD,X, O	A	NE	US	FE
94	A,P,S	ALL,O	A	UB	GB	FE
95	P	O	O		US	FWR
96	P	O	A	UB	US	FE
97	A	ONL	B	O	O	FE
98	S	O	A	NE	US	FE
99	A,S	ALL,O	B	O	O	FE
100	P	O	A	UB	US	FWR
101	A,P	AV,ILL,ONL,DD,X	A	O	US	FE
102	A	O	O	O	US	FWR
103	A	ONL	O	O	US	FE
104	P	O	A	CO	US	FE

APPENDIX D

Articles Examined

American Libraries 1992. No borrowing fees in Florida town. 23 (January): 19.

American Libraries 1992. LC seeks fee authorization. 23 (July/August): 545.

American Libraries 1992. LC fee legislation examined. 23 (September): 617.

American Libraries 1992. Patron to challenge reserve fee in court. 23 (September): 622.

American Libraries 1993. LC fee legislation: Round two. 24 (February): 112.

American Libraries 1993. ILL fees okay, says judge. 24 (March): 217.

American Libraries 1993. LC fee legislation reintroduced. 24 (April): 288.

American Libraries 1993. Seattle PL drops fee plan. 24 (May): 377.

American Libraries 1993. Stanford Medical Library to charge fees. 24 (June): 471.

American Libraries 1996. Consolidation fears prompted. 27 (November): 19.

Anderson, A. J. And Joyce Meldrem. 1993. How do you manage? Library Journal 118 (May 1): 50-54.

AACA. Antique Automobile Club of America. [Online] Available http://www.classocar.com/museums/aacalbry/aacalbry.htm, April 20, 1997.

Baskin, Cathryn. 1997. The death of the free Web? PC World 15 (May): 17.

Berry, John N. 1996. PLA stacks the deck for fees. Library Journal 121 (April 15): 6.

Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information 1986. The role of fees in supporting supporting library and information services in public and academic libraries. New York : R.R. Bowker, 89-112.

Bridges, M. B. 1993. The fee or free controversy. Current Studies in Librarianship 17 (Spring/Fall): 43-50.

Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science: 1993. Technology-driven resource

sharing: Paying for improvement. 19 (June/July): 20-23.

Bunting, Alison. 1994. Legal considerations for document delivery services. Medical Library Association 82 (April): 183-187.

Business Journal Serving Greater Portland 1993 Multnomah County Library must check out entrepreneurial ideas. 10 (July 5): 10.

Casale, M. 1995. Any color you like. Library Manager 9 (July/August): 18-20.

Chamberlain, Jenny. 1996. Look to your libraries. North and South, no. 128 (November): 6.

Clinton, K. 1995. Charging users for remote document supple in UK university libraries. Interlending and Document Supply 23, no. 4: 14-19.

Coffman, Steve. 1991. Doing it for money. Library Journal 116 (October 15): 32-36.

____. 1995. Fee-based services and the future of libraries. Journal of Library Administration 20, no. 3-4: 167-186.

Cram, Jennifer. 1996. Hitting the high C's: The role of culture, currency, courage and curiosity in developing charging. APLIS 9 (September/October): 133-146.

Davis, Maribelle. 1991. The invisible hand: Economic reaiity. Public Library Quarterly 11, no. 4: 3-11.

Deloughry, Thomas J. 1993. Remaking scholarly publishing. Chronicle of Higher Education 40, no. 17: A15-A18.

Department of City of Hamilton, Ontario. Hamilton Public Library. [Online] Available Http://www.hpl.hamilton.on.ca/library/SUPPORT/FACT1.HTM, April 20, 1997.

Deutsch, P. 1995. Bandwidth too cheap to meter. Internet World 6 (January): 95-97.

Dubberly, Ronald A. 1986. Managing NOT to charge fees. American Libraries (October): 670-676.

Editor and Publisher 1997. Dow Jones Publications Library. 130 (February 15): 27.

Electronic Documents 1995. Access control: Some current approaches. 4 (January): 21-24.

Electronic Information Resources Committee. Interlibrary Loan. [Online] Available

http://servers.medlib.hscbklyn.edu/depts/ill.html, April 25, 1997.

Ernest, Douglas J. 1993. Academic libraries, fee-based information services, and the business community. RQ 32 (Spring): 393-402.

Farmer, Jean. 1995. Consumer attitudes towards paying for public library service. Public Library Journal 10 (March/April): 44-45.

Favret, Leo. 1994. Bromley's business information service: A public library fee based service. Public Library Journal 9 (January/February): 15-17.

Fields, Howard. 1992. Publishers oppose Library of Congress plan to sell services. Publishers Weekly 239 (August 10): 10.

____. 1993. LC fee-for-services plan may be blocked by budget cuts. Publishers Weekly 240 (March 15): 7+.

Fuchs, H. 1994. Interlending and document delivery in the United Germany with special reference to aspects of charging. Inspel 28, no. 4: 436-443.

Gaughan, Thomas M. 1993. Multnomah may charge for telephone reference. American Libraries 24 (April): 288+.

Gee, David R. 1996. Survey of fee-based information services. The Law Librarian 27 (June): 78-82.

George, Lee Anne. 1993. Fee-based information services and document delivery. Wilson Library Bulletin 67 (February): 41-44+.

Glenn, J. 1995/1996. A few thoughts on effectiveness. An Leabharlann 12, no. 2 & 3: 67-72.

Gould, S. 1996. The IFLA voucher scheme: An alternative payment for international ILL. DF Revy 18 (January-Special Issue): 271-274.

Grad, Shelby. 1995. Libraries hope fee hikes will help balance the books; Revenue: Supervisors due to vote on a plan that officials say may raise $1.5 million annually for the 28-branch county system. Los Angeles Times 3 June, sec. B, p. 1.

Gregory, A. 1993. Pay-as-you-go vs. All-u-can-eat: Trends in online pricing Paper presented as part of the proceedings of the 14th National Online Meeting, New York, 4-6 May.

Grotenhuis, A. J. And S.J. Heijnekamp. 1995. The user pays: Cost billing in a company

library. Bottom Line 8, no. 4: 26-31.

Haak, John. 1995. Information services and economic development: New opportunities for collaboration. Journal of Library Administration 20, no. 3-4: 57-79.

Houston Academy of Medicine-Texas Medical Center Library. Cardholder fees. [Online] Available http://dbs.library.tmc.edu/fees.html, April 25, 1997.

Hubbard, W. J. and J. P. O'Brien. 1994. Price elasticity of library photocopies: An empirical demonstration of the law of demand. Collection Management 19, no. 1/2: 101-109.

Hyams, P. 1995. Online payment mechanisms. Online and CD-ROM Review 19 (June): 168-170.

Iivonen, Mirja. 1993. Time to pay? The practices and challenges of charging for database searches in Finland. Online and CD-ROM Review 17 (June): 149-155.

Jankowski, T. A. And E. R. Martin. 1994. Database search services as a basic service in academic health science libraries. Bulletin of the Medical Library Association 82 (October): 375-378.

Jarred, A. D. 1995. Fee vs. free: Maintaining the balance. LLA Bulletin 58 (Summer): 19-24.

Josephine, Helen B. 1995. Fee-based services: An option for meeting the information needs of the business community. The Reference Librarian no. 49-50: 195-203.

Kartman, Jon. 1995. Reference-for-fee service stirs debate at SFPL. American Libraries 26 (September): 750.

Landis, C. 1995. Charging: A limit to access or a means to provide service? Archifacts (April): 26-31.

Larson, Elizabeth. 1993. Support Libraries Privately. USA Today 12 April, sec. A, p. 12.

Lehtonen, Kimmo. Helsinki City Library library rules. [Online] Available http://www.lib.hel.fi/english/rules.html#maksut, April 25, 1997.

Library Journal 1993. Multnomah to charge for phone reference; Commissioners order library to charge for telephone services. 118 (April 1): 20+.

Library of Congress Information Bulletin 1991. LC fee-for-services bill introduced in Senate. 50 (August 12): 305.

Lilly, Erica. Kent State University Libraries and Media Services The Info Express Service. [Online] Available http://www.library.kent.edu/access/infoexp.html, April 25, 1997.

____. Photocopy services. [Online] Available http://www.library.edu/services/photocopy.html, April 25, 1997.

Lourie, Ben. Library fees and services. [Online] Available http://w3.ime.net/~cleaves/services.htm, April 20, 1997.

Lunin, Lois F. 1996. Costs and pricing of library and information services in transition. Journal of the American Society for Information Service 47 (March): 207-246.

Marks, Kenneth. 1992. Libraries: No longer free of fee. North Carolina Libraries (Special Edition): 20-23.

____. 1995. How much is enough? North Carolina Libraries. 53 (Spring): 24.

McDaniel, Elizabeth and Ronald Epp. 1995. Fee-based information services: The promises and pitfalls of a new revenue source in higher education. Journal of Academic Librarianship 18 (Summer): 35-39.

McGuire, Kathy. 1993. Information direct-Birmingham Library Services' fee-based business service. The Law Librarian 24 (September): 125-126.

Mendelsohn, S. 1995. The charging game. Library Manager. 10 (September): 10-11.

Monroe Public Library. Adult Services. [Online] Available http://www.biblio.org/monroe/adult.htm, April 20, 1997.

Murphy, Joseph. Fines and fees. [Online] Available http://midas.org/libs/mar/fines.html, April 25, 1997.

Novak, J. Membership fees. [Online] Available http://www.clelaw.lib.oh.us/public/membersh/memfees.htm, April 25, 1997.

Olson, Renee. 1995. Public access and cyberporn are focus of Senate telecom bill. School Library Journal 41 (May): 17.

____. 1996. Telecom industry lobbies for limited library discounts; Library response weak. School Library Journal 42 (June): 11-12.

Online and CD-ROM Review 1995. Electronic charging mechanisms for information. 19 (January): 29-32.

Palmdale City Library. Fees schedule. [Online] Available http://pages.prodigy.com/CA/palmdale/pdlibfee.html, April 25, 1997.

Pinkowitz, Janet Rhoads. 1996. Fee-based services at the Columbia Law School Library. The Law Librarian 27 (June): 88-89.

Ratliff, Priscilla. 1995. Three years experience with fee-based services in a corporate library. Special Libraries 86 (Winter): 21-27.

Rogers, Michael. 1992. Library Science database. Library Journal 117 (June 15): 28.

Rouillard, Camille. 1993. Fees for library service: A sound management device. Documentation and Bibliotheques 39 (January/March): 37-38.

Rousseau, Denis. 1993. Free information? Absolutely. Documentation and Bibliotheques 39 (January/March): 38-41.

Saunders-McMaster, Laverna. 1997. NTIS OrderNow online lets you search for free. Computers in Libraries 17, no. 3: 51.

Schindler, Jo Ann. A summary of HSPLS services. [Online] Available http://www.hcc.hawaii.edu/hspls/sumserv.html, April 20, 1997.

School Library Journal . 1996 MN library drops plan to raise children's fines to increase revenue. 42 (October): 12-13.

School Library Journal 1996. Charging for storytime? Pourquoi pas? 42 (December): 22.

Seebock, B. et. al. 1995. Payment services for global online systems including Internet. Electronic Library 13 (April): 127-141.

Shimpock-Vieweg, Kathy. 1996. Information for sale. Legal Assistant Today 13 (March/April): 72-76.

Shulman, Seth. 1992. Pay-per-view libraries. Technology Review 95 (October): 14-15.

Smith, Wendy. 1993. Fee-based services: Are they worth it? Library Journal 118 (June 15): 40-43.

Snyder, J. 1995. Paying for the net. Internet World 6 (January): 90-91.

Stieg, Margaret F. 1985. Fee vs free in historical perspective. In Conflicts in Reference Services, ed. Bill Katz and Ruth A. Fraley, 93-103. New York: Haworth Press.

Texas Medical Association. Library fees. [Online] Available http://www.texmed.org/library/fees.htm, April 20, 1997.

Tilson, Yvette. 1995. Income generation and pricing in libraries. The Bottom Line 8, no. 2: 23-36.

Trail, Mary Ann. "1993-1994. Fee-based services: Do they have a place in our libraries? New Jersey Libraries 27 (Winter): 22-24.

Tuchmayer, Harry. 1995. When you're deserving -- there's never enough!. North Carolina Libraries 53 (Spring): 25.

Tymbios, Carine. 1996. Doing it for money -- the Infobank way. The Law Librarian 27 (June): 100-103.

Veron, Ilyse J. 1993. Nation's library maps route to the electronic age. Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report 51 (May 15): 1201-1207.

Welch, Lee. 1991. Pilgrim's progress: Business information twelve months on. Australian Library Review 8 (November): 365-370.

White, Herbert S. 1993. Fee vs free: A catchy but not very meaningful option. Library Journal 118 (September 15): 55-56.

Woo, Christina. 1987. Fee vs free: Philosophical considerations in charging for services in Colorado's academic and selected public libraries. Colorado Libraries (September): 17-19.

Wood, Wendy D. 1993. A librarian's guide to fee-based services. The Reference Librarian no. 40: 121-129.

Young, Jeffrey R. 1997. U. Of Minnesota imposes fee for spending excessive time connected to its network. Chronicle of Higher Education 43 (April 4): A21.

Young, Peter R. 1994. Changing information access economics: New roles for libraries and librarians. Information Technology and Libraries 13 (June): 103-114.

REFERENCE LIST

Anderson, A.J. and Joyce Meldrem. 1993. How do you manage? Library Journal 118 (May 1): 50-54.

Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information. 1986. The role of fees in supporting library and information services in public and academic libraries. New York : R.R. Bowker, 89-112.

Gee, David R. 1996. Survey of fee-based information services. The Law Librarian 27 (June): 78-82.

Giacoma, Pete. 1989. The fee or free decision. New York : Neal-Schuman, 147-174.

Grad, Shelby. 1995. Libraries hope fee hikes will help balance the books; Revenue: Supervisors Due to vote on a plan that officials say may raise $1.5 million annually for the 28-branch county system. Los Angeles Times 3 June, sec. B, p. 1.

LC fee legislation reintroduced. 1993. American Libraries. 24 (April): 288.

Marks, Kenneth. 1992. Libraries: No longer free of fee. North Carolina Libraries (Special Edition): 20-23.

MN library drops plan to raise children's fines to increase revenue. 1996. School Library Journal 42 (October): 12-13.

No borrowing fees in Florida town 1992. American Libraries. 23 (January): 19.

Ratliff, Priscilla. 1995. Three years experience with fee-based services in a corporate library. Special Libraries 86 (Winter): 21-27.

Saunders-McMaster, Laverna. 1997. NTIS OrderNow online lets you search for free. Computers in Libraries 17, no. 3: 51.

Schindler, Jo Ann. A summary of HSPLS services. [online] Available http://www.hcc.hawaii.edu/hspls/sumserv.html, April 20, 1997.

Schulman, Seth. 1992. Pay-per-view libraries. Technology Review 95 (October): 14-15

Stanford Medical Library to charge fees. 1993. American Libraries. 24 (June): 471.